

1 end still. That still requires certification if we're  
2 talking about a disability issue.

3 And so we can kind of look at it, sit down with  
4 the interested parties, have a good discussion and say,  
5 okay, where do things fit, what makes sense. Actually,  
6 within Part 68 today we have certain things like passive  
7 components, adapters, extension cords, and so forth that in  
8 essence we say are a verification because we've said no  
9 registration is required and the manufacturers asked to have  
10 test data on record that their complies, but nothing is  
11 required, so in essence we do have some grading system  
12 today. But I think if that's the choice, then we need to  
13 sit down within industry and have a good discussion on it.

14 MS. MAGNOTTI: Mr. Shinn.

15 MR. SHINN: John Shinn, Nortel Networks.

16 Again, I say as a large manufacturer, I make PBXs,  
17 but we also have a wide variety of telephone, everything  
18 from regular tops to smart telephones, if you will, pay  
19 phones, credit card phones, a very wide variety. And rather  
20 than trying to put telephones as a TCB versus a PBX, which  
21 is a large complex system, takes quite a bit of time to  
22 test, evaluate, myself I would like -- and I have the  
23 laboratory, I have the equipment, I have the facilities, I  
24 have the competence, I have the personnel to test the wide  
25 variety of things, and including the hearing aid

1 compatibility issues, the volume control issues coming up  
2 and other disability issues, and we're working very hard to  
3 make sure that those issues are addressed appropriately in  
4 all of our products across the board.

5 And so I don't see where I would be breaking out  
6 one group of products to go to a certain type of evaluation  
7 and another product to be doing this. I would --  
8 declaration of conformity, for me, would be -- across the  
9 board would be the best way for me.

10 MS. MAGNOTTI: Mr. Salinas.

11 MR. SALINAS: Yes. I'm Jimmy Salinas, SBC.

12 As a carrier, I see all items that connect to my  
13 network, whether it's a small phone or a very large PBX, all  
14 have the same possibility of doing damage to the network,  
15 all have the same possibility of affecting the person next  
16 to me, third party, all have the same possibility of  
17 unbalancing the line and drawing and drawing high current  
18 into the line. So no matter how small the object or no  
19 matter how large the object, I would prefer to see an  
20 accredited lab test each one of those devices, whether it's  
21 done internally, externally, whether it's done with a TCB or  
22 not.

23 And for the example given earlier several times  
24 about the Part 15 associated with a personal computer that  
25 has variable combinations of possibilities, that's fine

1     until you connect the modem, put a modem in that computer  
2     and then connect that computer to the line. Then you've got  
3     to fall under Part 68 again. Even if I buy a computer that  
4     already has a modem preexisting in it, there has to be paper  
5     work telling me that that modem complies with 68; has  
6     nothing to do with 15; has to do with 68.

7             So no matter how small the item or no matter how  
8     large the item, they should all be tested the same because  
9     they all have the possibility of damaging the network.

10            MS. MAGNOTTI: Thank you.

11            Any -- yes, Mr. Pinkham.

12            MR. PINKHAM: Clint Pinkham, Thomson Consumer  
13     Electronics.

14            I've been trying to sit here and not say anything  
15     today but I get to a point.

16            From a manufacturer's standpoint, I have to  
17     reiterate that from a product performance standpoint, from a  
18     test and measurement standpoint, it really doesn't make any  
19     difference to us whether it's verification, certification,  
20     DOC or TCB. We have to make a product that works, that  
21     works with the system. We have to take that data, we have  
22     to keep it on file.

23            The difference to us is whether or not we have to  
24     go through some administrative procedures to have this  
25     animal certified before we can bring it to market.

Heritage Reporting Corporation  
(202) 628-4888

1 Jimmy mentions on many occasions that the networks  
2 have a fear that there is going to be equipment out there  
3 that basically brings down the network, and we have that  
4 fear too. Without the network, we can't sell telephones.

5 Let me reiterate that we have to make the  
6 measurements, we have to stand behind that product  
7 regardless of the level we're talking. Our concern is one  
8 of time to market. We want to take a system that allows us  
9 to get new technology or even existing technology,  
10 modifications of existing products, to market as soon as  
11 humanly possible. This, to us, is big money.

12 We're not talking just a few bucks to pay to a  
13 certified laboratory or a certification fee. We're talking  
14 about the difference in costs between a new product and an  
15 old product times the number of those products that might be  
16 sold during the period when we can't get it to market  
17 because we're going through a certification process.

18 I guess I get a little upset when I hear the talk  
19 about trust, or where the manufacturers go, and we're going  
20 to do strange and horrible things.

21 I mentioned yesterday the concept of building on a  
22 risk basis, which was misinterpreted to mean that we would  
23 go ahead and manufacture, and if the product did not meet  
24 specs, we would then ship that product that did not meet  
25 spec. That's not the risk that I'm talking about.

Heritage Reporting Corporation  
(202) 628-4888

1           The risk we face is we go ahead and manufacture  
2 before the tests are complete, and if we blow it, we rack  
3 and stack that crap, and then rework it. That's a big cost.  
4 We don't ship it.

5           I guess I pretty much got that off my chest.  
6 Thanks for the opportunity.

7           MS. MAGNOTTI: Okay, thank you.

8           Mr. Whitesell.

9           MR. WHITESELL: Thank you. Steve Whitesell, Lucent  
10 Technologies, Consumer Products, and I emphasize the  
11 "Consumer Products" because we're making telephones,  
12 answering systems, those sorts of products, as distinguished  
13 from PBXs.

14           The laboratory that I've been associated with has  
15 been in the business of testing these products since the  
16 beginning of Part 68. It moved from Indianapolis to New  
17 Jersey, but it still has that capability.

18           So from that viewpoint, we are not a certified  
19 laboratory, and I believe that we are a competent laboratory  
20 and can continue to do that testing, and so the verification  
21 process is one that I would prefer.

22           However, if the Commission decides not to allow  
23 the verification process, then I would prefer very much not  
24 be pinned to one or the other of TCB certification or  
25 declaration of conformity, but I would rather be allowed to

1 do either of those processes on the presumption that, first  
2 of all, what we're looking for there, if we decide not to do  
3 verification, is some third party certification of  
4 something. In the case of requiring certification of the  
5 laboratory in order to do declaration of conformity, we're  
6 asking for a third party certification of the competence of  
7 the laboratory whereas in the TCB process we're allowing my  
8 laboratory to continue to do the testing, but then having a  
9 third party certification of the test results and presumably  
10 maybe of the test procedures that I use. So there is -- in  
11 either of those cases, there is a third party certification  
12 that if the Commission feels is necessary, I would prefer to  
13 have the option rather than being confined to one or the  
14 other.

15 Thank you.

16 MS. MAGNOTTI: Thank you.

17 Ms. Wride.

18 MS. WRIDE: This is Anh Wride, CCS.

19 Just wanted to make the point that when we talk  
20 about trust, it is not so much that we don't trust the  
21 manufacturers, you know. It's more like to protect the  
22 integrity of the system in the case that there are  
23 manufacturers who do not have -- suppliers who do not have  
24 headquarter presence in the U.S., for example, who may find  
25 it desirable or, you know, to meet their ends to bypass the

1 system. Certainly that will in the end hurt the  
2 conscientious manufacturers as well, because they play by  
3 the rule where the other ones do not.

4 MR. BERRESFORD: Mr. Shinn.

5 MR. SHINN: Again, John Shinn, Nortel Networks.

6 As it's very obvious, I support the declaration of  
7 conformity. In listening to the comments and conversation,  
8 and I see that the TCB as being a viable alternative for --  
9 as Anh had indicated -- offshore manufacturers and people  
10 who are small manufacturers who really can't support their  
11 own labs, and who probably don't have, or do not have the  
12 expertise for the testing and probably need help. And I  
13 think the third party could be a good, viable solution for  
14 them, and so between the SDOC and the TCB, which I don't see  
15 as my using it, but I see it as something that could be of  
16 use, and during the transition period it's possible that  
17 they may be -- may find it not be viable, and as a  
18 transition, and I would go for the declaration of  
19 conformity.

20 MS. MAGNOTTI: Any other comments? Okay.

21 MR. BERRESFORD: Thank you.

22 Does anyone else on this table have any other  
23 questions or comments to make?

24 MR. VARMA: John, not on this issue, do we have  
25 any questions of the panelists? I had some other area that

1 I wanted to get into.

2 MR. BERRESFORD: No, I don't.

3 MR. VARMA: I think we had a good discussion when  
4 the points were made that there has to be the force and  
5 effect of law; that the FCC has to hang in there; that there  
6 has to be some sort of an enforcement mechanism.

7 The general question that I would like to raise at  
8 this point for comments from anyone is that as we shift into  
9 a new paradigm, and as we privatize as much of Part 68 as we  
10 possibly can, do you envision any changes to the enforcement  
11 mechanism that we ought to consider? Should we leave the  
12 enforcement mechanism the way it is? Should we strengthen  
13 it? Should we change it?

14 So the general issue that I put before you for  
15 consider is what do we do as far as enforcement is  
16 concerned? Any changes?

17 Trone.

18 MR. BISHOP: Trone Bishop with Bell Atlantic.

19 Number one, I would say the present system  
20 requires -- because the FCC is acting as people have  
21 characterized it, as a gatekeeper, I see very little  
22 enforcement is needed from the FCC.

23 So if you change, if you eliminate the FCC as the  
24 gatekeeper, I don't see any recourse other than the FCC to  
25 increase the number of people devoted to enforcement of



1     these rules. That's why, in my opinion, I don't see how you  
2     can -- to me, it would always take fewer people to be the  
3     gatekeeper than to do enforcement. However, I understand  
4     that that increases the time to market and has other types  
5     of disadvantages that people have talked about.

6             So I would think if you're going to -- that  
7     enforcement is going to require a lot more resources than  
8     you've devoted to it so far.

9             MR. VARMA: So do you still think that there will  
10    be a gatekeeper DSO, there will be a TCB, and things would  
11    actually filter through those before they reach the FCC for  
12    enforcement purposes?

13            MR. BISHOP: Well, I do see in the TCB process  
14    that there -- the TCB then becomes the gatekeeper. Some of  
15    the other processes, there is essentially no gatekeeper, so  
16    that's why I think it increases the risk of nonconforming  
17    equipment and would require greater enforcement effort in  
18    the long run.

19            MR. VARMA: So in this one area, I suppose, the  
20    role of the FCC might possibly have to be increased even as  
21    we are trying to decrease the FCC's role in the other areas?

22            MR. BISHOP: That's my opinion, yes.

23            MR. VARMA: Okay, so you see no opportunities for  
24    us not to have to increase our enforcement function and  
25    resources?

1           MR. BISHOP: No. In fact, you know, this  
2 particular forums we set aside things like hearing aid  
3 compatibility and volume control and those sort of issues  
4 which there are rules in Part 68 for. We set that aside and  
5 said we're not going to talk about that because you're not  
6 going to consider dropping that.

7           Then we -- but that is an area that you may well  
8 find you're going to need to enforce that because it's a  
9 critical area. You're going to have possibly more  
10 complaints from certain consumer segments over products. So  
11 I think when you factor that into it, and also, we -- there  
12 are products being -- there are companies that are having  
13 trouble meeting these particular hearing aid compatibility  
14 requirements and volume control. So I think it's an area  
15 that if we go to the declaration of conformity or some type  
16 of verification, I think you're going to see products out in  
17 the marketplace that not only have the potential for harm,  
18 but they have this potential for not complying with the  
19 hearing aid compatibility and volume control rules.

20           MR. VARMA: Okay. Anh?

21           MS. WRIDE: I just wanted to say that if the FCC  
22 is going to not certify products in the future and, you  
23 know, allow either going to the TCB program or the SDOC  
24 program, you can -- the resources that you are devoting  
25 right now to do registration can be redirected towards

1 enforcement, but maybe you are thinking of a bigger, bloated  
2 program of enforcement, and maybe that's not necessary.

3           You know, all you need to do is just have a  
4 program but with the perception out there that big brother  
5 is watching, and like someone mentioned yesterday, it's  
6 amazing how we -- how we do things right when we know  
7 someone is watching, and that's the only thing that is  
8 probably needed, and not so much, you know, going out, you  
9 know, market surveillance in big droves, perhaps that's not  
10 necessary.

11           MR. VARMA: You know, and as Kurt mentioned  
12 earlier, we are really strapped for resources, and there  
13 have been some requests for waivers that we have not been  
14 able to act in an expeditious manner.

15           What I would hope and prefer to see is  
16 reallocation of our resources currently devoted to Part 68  
17 to other priorities that we have before the Bureau, as well  
18 as before the Network Services Division, as opposed to  
19 reallocating those resources for Part 68 functionalities.  
20 Otherwise, we would never be able to do some of the other  
21 things in a timely manner that are before us.

22           So if there is any opportunity for us at all to  
23 explore the possibility of reducing FCC's resources devoted  
24 to Part 68, not only in terms of certification but also  
25 enforcement, I think I would like to invite any thoughts on

Heritage Reporting Corporation  
(202) 628-4888

1       that issue.

2               Bill?

3               MR. HURST: Yes. Bill Hurst.

4               As we look at the TCB program, one of the criteria  
5       placed on TCBs is to participate in market surveillance, and  
6       there are certain requirements placed on them, and so a  
7       portion of that can then be moved to those private entities  
8       through that mechanism.

9               The systems of declaration of conformity and  
10       verification are very dependent upon a very strong market  
11       enforcement. If you look at the European model, here in  
12       Washington two months ago the German government came and  
13       presented what they were doing enforcement for EMC, and they  
14       were talking about hundreds of people within the German  
15       system enforcing the EMC regulations, and that's what allows  
16       the market declaration of conformity to work, so that the  
17       market surveillance is what allows these lesser oversight  
18       systems to work.

19               My concern is that the FCC does not have the  
20       resources to do that, and so we need to look at the private  
21       system to make sure that we come to the challenge and ensure  
22       the integrity of that. And so I believe that becomes a rule  
23       that the TCBs can provide that type of activity, and perhaps  
24       we can even expand what they have been asked to do within  
25       this moment within Docket 98-68.

Heritage Reporting Corporation  
(202) 628-4888

1 MR. VARMA: Okay, thank you.

2 John.

3 MR. SHINN: Thank you. John Shinn, Nortel  
4 Networks.

5 Again, as I stated yesterday, and today also, the  
6 enforcement activities of the FCC I feel should be much more  
7 visible, and my -- it's my understanding, I may be wrong,  
8 but it's my understanding that the enforcement primarily is  
9 responding to complaints. When you get enough complaints,  
10 you do something.

11 I would sort of like to point to a different  
12 issue. As I mentioned yesterday, a Mr. Hollingsworth within  
13 your FCC organization who is dealing primarily with the  
14 amateur radio service, him and one other gentleman, I can't  
15 recall his name, but have created a -- you know, have done a  
16 lot in the visibility. They have worked with the amateur  
17 community as I would assume that the enforcement people  
18 would work with the manufacturers and importers of  
19 telecommunication equipment. He's created a lot of good  
20 will, and he's created an environment where people know that  
21 the enforcement is out there. He's advertising the fact  
22 that he's going to shut you down if you don't comply, and as  
23 a result you're going to find -- you're finding good will  
24 with the people who are really -- the good people that are  
25 doing the things they are supposed to do. They like the

1 idea, and with one or two people you've done a tremendous  
2 job in enforcing the amateur radio service. And I think  
3 that this could be done in a similar fashion within the Part  
4 68 group with the limited amount of resources that you do  
5 have without having to put a lot of resources, and it's a  
6 lot of how we do it rather than just getting a bunch of  
7 people out there and going for it.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. BERRESFORD: Yes, Jimmy?

10 MR. SALINAS: Yes, sir, Jimmy Salinas,  
11 Southwestern Bell.

12 It's an issue, as John stated, that you need to be  
13 out there and letting people know that you will react and  
14 that you will do the enforcement. Within the industry,  
15 whether it's a DOC verification or TCB, the industry knows  
16 how to report the complaints. They know what procedures  
17 they have to follow.

18 As shown in the report where you all have a report  
19 card of how the telecommunication industry is doing earlier  
20 this year, the majority of your report is to the consumer  
21 and the consumer does not know that path to go to to the  
22 TCB, to go to the standards group, to go to the DOC. They  
23 are going to come to you. You're going to -- that's where  
24 your major problem is going to be, and that's where you're  
25 going to have to put a lot of your enforcement power. The

Heritage Reporting Corporation  
(202) 628-4888

1 industry doesn't need that.

2           You need it because the consumer is doing it, and  
3 with a change in the technology and with less and less  
4 people understanding the new technology, the first thing  
5 they are going to do is they're going to call their local  
6 provider, and if they get no help from their local provider,  
7 they will go to their local municipality. If that's not  
8 allowed, the PUC, the next thing is the FCC, and your  
9 trouble reports from the consumer have increased  
10 tremendously, and that side of the house, yeah, you're going  
11 to be in the business for a long time because the FCC is the  
12 final call that the lady living on the corner of 5th and  
13 Main has.

14           MR. BERRESFORD: Mr. Bipes.

15           MR. BIPES: John Bipes, Mobil Engineering.

16           A short answer to your question on enforcement is  
17 in the meantime, however that might be defined in the  
18 present time, if FCC would refrain from giving the  
19 impression to the industry that it doesn't care and it  
20 shouldn't take too much time or resources to do that, that  
21 will allow those of us who are consultants and test labs and  
22 so on to continue to communicate the idea that it does  
23 matter; that Part 68 still is something that needs to be  
24 reckoned with, and I find that the people with whom I work,  
25 if I can say that it matters and that the FCC is behind us,

Heritage Reporting Corporation  
(202) 628-4888

1 that accomplishes the purpose.

2 MR. VARMA: Any other comments on the broad issue  
3 of enforcement?

4 Thank you, John. Back to you.

5 MR. BERRESFORD: Thank you.

6 Are there any other comments on any subject?

7 Mr. Bipes.

8 MR. BIPES: John Bipes, Mobil Engineering.

9 I want to give a bit of a perspective. I don't  
10 know if 15 years working with Part 68 authorizes me to do  
11 that. If not, I can tell you that I came to  
12 telecommunications about 25 years ago when I began working  
13 with cellular design. Nonetheless, I will give a little bit  
14 of a perspective.

15 It seems to me that telecom versus many other  
16 technologies that impact upon our society has in fact been  
17 on a greater slope of acceleration, improvement, speed,  
18 information, than almost any other aspect that affects our  
19 lives. I think that that has to be kept in mind. I would  
20 guess that it's maybe in some cases outstripped our other  
21 meaningful technologies by a rate of 10 to one, and it seems  
22 as if there is an interest in making it 100 to one.

23 The wisdom of doing that, I don't know. When I  
24 get on an airplane and I see a fellow that can't put his  
25 cellular phone in his pocket but has to conduct business,



1 walking down the aisle, strapping on his seat belt, I lament  
2 that I was involved in the development of cellular phones in  
3 the first place. I had some prediction that a person would  
4 no longer have any privacy either in the car or in the  
5 bathroom if cellular phones became what they are today, and  
6 I think I was at least partially correct.

7 We've had historically the best of governmental  
8 involvement with industry, the FCC and the industry,  
9 particularly the TIA, with which I have firsthand  
10 experience. I think that's nothing that we should be  
11 embarrassed about or make apologies for, and that's in the  
12 last 15 years.

13 I have a brother who works with the FAA and he  
14 finds that the way that the FCC works with its constituent  
15 industry is almost a model of very good working together  
16 cooperation, forming a consensus, avoiding heavy-handed  
17 dealings one with the other. I think it's been in spite of  
18 the complaints that we hear for dollars or the five weeks of  
19 time it might take to grant a registration, from my own  
20 point of view I think it's been a reasonably minimal  
21 hardship. There has been economic hardship. I think there  
22 has been reasonably minimal economic hardship. Hardship in  
23 terms of safety, I think there have been few lives lost,  
24 very few people who have been electrocuted, and I think that  
25 Part 68 has a lot to do with that in terms of safety to

1 telecom personnel.

2 I think it's been a minimal expense to the FCC  
3 when in my simplistic view I take a look at the fees that  
4 are supplied by registration applicants versus the amount of  
5 dollar costs that it must take for the FCC to administer the  
6 program, it seems to me to be about a wash.

7 Now, I know in fact that the FCC cannot operate on  
8 that same basis. I think the FCC operates on governmental  
9 allocation and the fees go into an entirely different  
10 category, but at least in terms of dollars in versus dollars  
11 out, it seems to me as if it's comparatively self-  
12 supporting.

13 Now, having said all of those positive things from  
14 a perspective, from a historical perspective, I do want to  
15 say that there are some things that really could change, and  
16 one of those that has surfaced time and again is the length  
17 of time it takes to change the rule.

18 In the last 10 or 15 years, we've had what we call  
19 the official rule and the unofficial rule. The unofficial  
20 rule is the interpretation of the rule that appears in the  
21 Part 68 registration guide. I've sometimes had trouble  
22 breathing thinking about what might happen if push came to  
23 shove in a court of law with regard to an official rule  
24 versus an unofficial rule. Hopefully, that can come onto  
25 higher ground and the official rules can change much more

1 quickly.

2 I would recommend at this point that with 98-68  
3 being apparently the continuum that we are on, that we would  
4 continue in that direction; that as an SDO, that my greatest  
5 familiarity is with TIA, particularly TR-41.9 under the very  
6 capable leadership of Anh Wride, that that industry forming  
7 consensus be relied upon to be the place where everybody  
8 goes for interpretations of db's volts and microseconds  
9 issues on a rather timely basis. We meet on a quarterly  
10 basis, and, in fact, even between those quarterly meetings  
11 there is a telecom network of people who can help solve  
12 problems, interpolate between the particular portions of the  
13 Part 68 rule, and continue FCC involvement with the SDO. If  
14 it should be TIA, fine, but nonetheless continue the FCC  
15 involvement.

16 And I think, in summary, what I'm trying to say is  
17 we shouldn't make too many apologies for what we have done  
18 so well already. Stay the course. Make changes, make  
19 positive changes. Be careful because step changes of a  
20 large magnitude can have destabilizing effects, and those  
21 are my thoughts.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. BERRESFORD: Thank you.

24 Any other comments in closing?

25 Ms. Wride?

1 MS. WRIDE: Yes. I just wanted to just speak up  
2 on what John said, that TR-41.9 and TIA, the other TR-41.11  
3 and TR-41.2 are very ready to help the FCC in any which way  
4 we can, technically and administratively to help you in this  
5 need, in this privatization effort.

6 MR. BERRESFORD: Mr. Bishop.

7 MR. BISHOP: Trone Bishop with Bell Atlantic.

8 My good friend, Bill McNamara from Bell South had  
9 to go catch an airplane and so he asked me to put in a plug  
10 for the Bixy wiring petition that the FCC has been  
11 considering for a number of years which hasn't acted on yet,  
12 and that is related to this matter here in that there are no  
13 rules in Part 68 that require a twisted pair on the customer  
14 premise, so non-twisted pair can be used, has been used, and  
15 is known to cause cross-talk problems, which we believe  
16 harm, can even be shown to harm third parties.

17 In a related matter, this wiring is substandard  
18 and not sufficient for the new advanced technologies that  
19 the manufacturers and carriers want to introduce to the  
20 public.

21 And so we feel that, and the Bixy wiring petition,  
22 if you look at it, it had no dissenting commenters at all,  
23 and it would -- it asks that the -- that it be made  
24 mandatory in Part 68 that wiring on customer premise be a  
25 minimum of Category 3 twisted pair wiring as defined by the

1 industry.

2 And so Bill was sorry he couldn't be here. He had  
3 to go catch his plane, but he wanted me to put in a plug for  
4 the Bixy petition. I want it to be on the record that I did  
5 so.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. BERRESFORD: Thank you.

8 Any further comments?

9 (No response.)

10 One or two notes in closing.

11 First of all, I would like to thank you all for  
12 coming here, particularly those who came from far away.  
13 This has been extremely helpful to us. I'm sure I speak for  
14 everybody here.

15 Second, we will be happy to receive a further  
16 round of written comments if anybody would like to make them  
17 on or before the 20th of this month. That is a week from  
18 today.

19 And finally, if I could just make a personal  
20 observation. With all of the comments that have been made  
21 about the need to protect the network and to maybe to go  
22 cautiously rather than with all prudent speed in changing,  
23 many of us have talked about how we've made a very good  
24 living off of Part 68 for 20 or 25 years, and when Part 68  
25 was created the public switched phone network was the only

1 way for the people of this country to send switched voice  
2 and data traffic. That is not the case anymore. There are  
3 not terrestrial wireless networks, there is satellite  
4 networks, cable TV networks are starting to handle voice and  
5 data switched traffic, and there are more high bandwidth  
6 networks being built. And so it seems to me that the public  
7 switched phone network has competition now.

8           And when you are the only network, you can have  
9 maybe 100 pages of rules in the CFR. But some of these other  
10 networks, I'm told, have as few as two. And if connection  
11 to the phone network continues to be harder than connection  
12 to other networks, traffic will leave the phone network and  
13 will go to those other networks.

14           And so there can be a point at which a network  
15 protects itself into obsolescence, and I would just ask us  
16 all to bear that in mind too.

17           Thank you all very much for coming again.

18           (Whereupon, at 12:00 Noon, the public fora was  
19 adjourned.)

20 //

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

**REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE**

FCC DOCKET NO.: N/A

CASE TITLE: PUBLIC FORA ON DEREGULATION/PRIVATIZATION

HEARING DATE: July 13, 1999

LOCATION: Washington, D.C.

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the Federal Communications Commission.

Date: \_7-13-99\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sharon Cook  
Official Reporter  
Heritage Reporting Corporation  
1220 "L" Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005

**TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE**

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence were fully and accurately transcribed from the tapes and notes provided by the above named reporter in the above case before the Federal Communications Commission.

Date: \_7-20-99\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Joyce Boe  
Official Transcriber  
Heritage Reporting Corporation

**PROOFREADER'S CERTIFICATE**

I hereby certify that the transcript of the proceedings and evidence in the above referenced case that was held before the Federal Communications Commission was proofread on the date specified below.

Date: \_7-22-99\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lorenzo Jones  
Official Proofreader  
Heritage Reporting Corporation

Heritage Reporting Corporation  
(202) 628-4888